## SOUTH CAROLINA PUBLIC SERVICE COMMISSION DOCKET NO. 2005-1-E DIRECT TESTIMONY OF PROGRESS ENERGY CAROLINAS, INC.

## WITNESS C.S. HINNANT

| 1 <b>C</b> | . N | r. Hinnant | , will y | ou p | olease state | your full | name, | occupation, | and address? |
|------------|-----|------------|----------|------|--------------|-----------|-------|-------------|--------------|
|------------|-----|------------|----------|------|--------------|-----------|-------|-------------|--------------|

- 2 A. My name is C.S. (Scotty) Hinnant. I am Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear
- Officer. My business address is 412 South Wilmington Street, Raleigh, N.C.
- 4 Q. By whom are you employed and in what capacity?
- 5 A. I am employed by Progress Energy Carolinas, Inc.
- Q. Please describe your duties as Senior Vice President and Chief Nuclear
   Officer.
- The Progress Energy nuclear fleet consists of 5 units located at 4 plants in the 8 A. Carolinas and Florida. The fleet's combined generating capability (summer 9 maximum dependable capacity) at year-end 2004 was 4,286 megawatts and the 10 fleet generated approximately 34.9 million megawatt-hours of energy in 2004. All 11 four site Vice Presidents report to me, along with the Vice President - Nuclear 12 Engineering and Services, the Manager - Performance Evaluation & Regulatory 13 Affairs, and the Manager - Nuclear Security. The four Carolina units under my 14 supervision which serve our customers in South Carolina are Brunswick Unit 1, 15 Brunswick Unit 2, Harris Unit 1, and Robinson Unit 2 which had a combined rated 16 capacity of 3,382 MW as of December 31, 2004. As a result of capital 17 improvements and modifications made during 2004, the Maximum Dependable 18 Capacity for the Carolina's units was increased to 3,448 MW. 19
  - Q. Please summarize briefly your educational background and experience.

- I graduated from North Carolina State University with a BS in Electrical
  Engineering. I have 36 years of nuclear power plant design, construction
  engineering, operation, and management experience with both pressurized water
  and boiling water reactors. I have worked at 3 nuclear power plants in various
  capacities, including, start-up and testing, maintenance manager, plant general
  manager, director of site operations, and site vice president.
- 7 Q. What is the purpose of your testimony here today?

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

- The purpose of my testimony is to review the performance of the Progress Energy
  Carolinas (PEC) nuclear generating facilities during the period of January 1, 2004
  through March 31, 2005 and the expected operating performance of the nuclear
  units for the projected period July 1, 2005 to June 30, 2006.
- Q. Please provide the Commission with an overview of the performance of the Company's nuclear units during the period under consideration?
  - A. Our nuclear fleet achieved an unadjusted net capacity factor of 92.9% for the calendar year 2004 with the Harris, Robinson, and Brunswick Plant posting unadjusted net capacity factors of 88.7%, 92.1%, and 95.4% respectively. Our nuclear fleet produced approximately 27.6 million MWH's of net generation in 2004. For the period January 1, 2004 through March 31, 2005 the nuclear fleet achieved a capacity factor of 92.9%. Our nuclear units: Harris Unit 1, Brunswick Unit 1, Brunswick Unit 2, and Robinson Unit 2 achieved capacity factors of 91.6%, 94.2%, 91.4%, and 94.8% respectively for the period January 1, 2004 through March 31, 2005

Q. Please discuss the refueling activities at your nuclear units during the period
January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2004.

A.

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

23

The Company refueled three of its nuclear units during 2004. Brunswick Unit 1 was taken off line on February 28, 2004 and returned to service on April 2, a duration of approximately 34 days. This outage came at the end of a fuel cycle that began on March 30, 2002. Brunswick Unit 1 achieved a capacity factor of 100.8% for the fuel cycle leading up to the refueling outage. In addition to planned refueling, inspections, and maintenance activities, the second phase of a two phase power uprate project was conducted during this outage. Certain modifications were implemented and certain plant equipment, such as feedwater heaters and main transformers, were replaced with newer and better equipment. As a result of the power uprate project, Brunswick Unit 1's Maximum Net Dependable Capacity was increased from 872 MWe to 938 MWe on January 1, 2005. Robinson Unit 2 was taken out of service on April 20, 2004 for a scheduled refueling outage and returned to service on May 28, 2004 a duration of approximately 39 days. This outage came at the end of a fuel cycle that began on November 14, 2002. Robinson Unit 2 achieved a capacity factor of 104.1% for the fuel cycle leading up to the refueling outage. In addition to replacement of approximately one third of the core's fuel assemblies, specific outage activities included inspection of the reactor vessel head; inspection of certain reactor vessel instrumentation penetrations; repairs to the under-vessel instrumentation piping supports; steam generator eddy current testing; and, work to facilitate replacement of the reactor vessel head during the next scheduled refueling outage.

Harris Unit 1 unit began a refueling outage on October 15, 2004 and returned to service on November 17, 2004 a duration of approximately 32 days. This outage came at the end of a fuel cycle that began on May 20, 2003. Harris Unit 1 achieved a capacity factor of 96.6% for the fuel cycle leading up to the refueling outage. During this outage, refueling, required maintenance and inspections were completed as planned. The outage was extended by about a week when outage scope to resolve operability issues with the feedwater isolation valves was added to the work to be completed during this outage. The unit was preparing to start-up from the refueling outage when damage was discovered on the feedwater isolation valves. These three valves are relatively new, so no maintenance had originally been planned during the outage. The valves were repaired and returned to service.

A.

## Q. Had Progress Energy taken reasonable precautions to prevent this type of incident?

Yes. The valve vendor that PEC purchased these valves from had decades of experience designing and manufacturing components for the nuclear industry. Based on the vendor's long history of success, PEC had every reason to believe that the design and manufacture of these components would be acceptable. Further, PEC has a vendor over sight program that is considered to be among the best in the country. At the time the valves were installed, detailed procedures and inspection requirements were in place to both ensure that the installations were accomplished properly as well as to preclude damage to the equipment during the installation process. Subsequent to this incident, we have applied the wisdom of hind sight to further enhance our procedures and safeguards.

- Q. How did the planned refueling outages impact the net capacity factors of the nuclear fleet?
- As I mentioned, the nuclear fleet achieved a net capacity factor of 92.9% in 2004 notwithstanding the fact that three of the Company's four nuclear units experienced refueling outages. That means that the fleet's actual generation was only 7.1% lower than it would have been had all of the units operated at their respective maximum dependable capacity levels 24 hours per day, 7 days per week, all 366 days of 2004.
- Q. During the review period January 1, 2005 through March 31, 2005, were any of the units refueled?
  - A. Brunswick Unit 2 was taken off line at 2201 hours on March 4, 2005 and remained off line through the end of the evaluation period for a scheduled refueling outage. This outage came at the end of a fuel cycle that began on April 6, 2003. Brunswick Unit 2 achieved a capacity factor of 101.6% for the fuel cycle leading up to the refueling outage. In addition to planned refueling, inspections, and maintenance activities, as we did with Unit 1, the second phase of a two phase power uprate project is being conducted during this outage. Certain modifications are being implemented and certain plant equipment, such as condensate and feedwater pumps, and main transformers, are being replaced with newer and higher capacity equipment.
- Q. During the period January 1, 2004 through December 31, 2004, did PEC's nuclear units experience any scheduled other outages?

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

1.5

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

Α.

2

3

4

5

6

7

8

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

| 1  |           | normal operating procedures. Following successful repair of RC-525 and             |
|----|-----------|--|
| 2  |           | subsequent clean-up activities, a normal plant startup was performed and the unit  |
| 3  |           | returned to service on October 14, 2004. The total duration of the forced outage   |
| 4  |           | was 47 hours 19 minutes. Due to the short duration of this outage, no additional   |
| 5  |           | work was performed that would impact future outage scope.                          |
| 6  | Q.        | Were there any non-refueling outages during the period January 1, 2005             |
| 7  |           | through March 31, 2005?  |
| 8  | <b>A.</b> | No.  |
| 9  | Q.        | How does PEC's nuclear operations compare with the nuclear industry?               |
| 10 | A.        | PEC continues to be a leader within the nuclear industry. For the three years      |
| 11 |           | ending on 12/31/2004, Progress Energy Carolinas' nuclear units achieved a net      |
| 12 |           | capacity factor of 95.98% compared to the industry average of 90.8% for the same   |
| 13 |           | period.  |
| 14 | Q.        | Beyond the Company's superior overall nuclear performance, can you cite            |
| 15 |           | any additional ways the Company's nuclear fleet is proactively taking steps to     |
| 16 |           | minimize fuel costs?   |
| 17 | <b>A.</b> | As I have already mentioned, our nuclear plants consistently deliver very high     |
| 18 |           | capacity factors reducing the generation that is needed from higher cost fuels     |
| 19 |           | Further, our nuclear fleet has taken advantage of industry experience and improved |
| 20 |           | technology to reduce the duration of nuclear refueling outages. For the five year  |

period ending in 1999, the fleet's average refueling outage duration was 41.2 days.

For the five year period ending December 31, 2004, the average refueling outage

duration was 36.8 days indicating a 10% reduction in refueling duration. Finally, I

21

22

will note that power uprate projects have been implemented at all four of the Company's units resulting in 274 additional megawatts of nuclear generating capacity that benefits our customers by displacing reliance on the more expensive coal, oil, and gas generation. And, as I mentioned earlier, the Company is also pursuing an additional power uprate at Brunswick Unit 2 during the 2005 refueling outage to further leverage the value of the nuclear fleet.

Q. Did the Company prudently operate its nuclear plants during the period January 1, 2004 through March 31, 2005?

1

2

3

4

5

6

9

10

11

12

13

14

15

16

17

18

19

20

21

22

A.

Yes, this is evidenced by the fact that our performance greatly exceeded the national average and as well as the standard adopted by the South Carolina General Assembly in S.C. Code Ann. Section 58-27-865 which creates a rebuttable presumption that a utility prudently operated its nuclear plants if the plants achieved a capacity factor of 92.5% excluding reasonable outage time associated with reasonable refueling, reasonable maintenance, reasonable repair, and the reasonable reduced power reasonable equipment replacement outages; generation experienced by nuclear units as they approach a refueling outage; the reasonable reduced power generation experienced by nuclear units associated with bringing a unit back to full power after an outage; Nuclear Regulatory Commission required testing outages unless due to the unreasonable acts of the utility; outages found by the Commission not to be within the reasonable control of the utility; and acts of God. As mentioned earlier, PEC achieved a nuclear capacity factor of 92.9% without excluding any outage time.

- Q. Did the Company take all actions reasonably possible and implement procedures reasonable calculated to prevent and/or avoid plant outages?
- Yes. The Company's high capacity factor and short scheduled outage durations is indicative of a well run nuclear system.
- Q. Please describe the projected performance of PEC's nuclear system for the time period January 1, 2005 through December 31, 2005.
- 7 A. Including the impact of planned refueling outages, I project that PEG's nuclear units will achieve an average net capacity factor of 94.2% during this period.
- 9 Q. What capacity factor do you project for the Carolina's nuclear fleet for the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006?
- I project that the nuclear fleet will achieve a capacity factor of 92.3% (based on estimated MDC for Brunswick-2 at 927 MWs effective 1/1/2006) for the period July 1, 2005 through June 30, 2006. During that time, refueling outages will be conducted at Robinson-2, Brunswick-1, and Harris
- 15 Q. Does this conclude your testimony?
- 16 A. Yes.